

A restriction requirement is proper when (1) the inventions are independent or distinct as claimed; and (2) there is a serious burden on the Examiner. Applicants respectfully submit that the examination of claims 67 and 133 together would not pose a serious burden on the Examiner. A search of the prior art of claim 67 would also necessarily encompass a search of the prior art for claim 133.

For these reasons, Applicants respectfully request that the restriction requirement be withdrawn.

## **II. Provisional Election of Species**

Applicants provisionally elect the species of independent claim 67 and dependent claims 68-77, 81-84, and 89-93, with traverse.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: July 9, 2010

/Jamie T. Wisz/  
Jamie T. Wisz  
Registration No.: 58,429  
Attorney for Applicant(s)

Wilmer Cutler Pickering Hale and Dorr LLP  
1875 Pennsylvania Avenue, N.W.  
Washington, DC 20006  
(202) 663-6000 (telephone)  
(202) 663-6363 (facsimile)